

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/510,337	10/05/2004	Kuniaki Kawaguchi	1226-298	8358	
23117 75	90 09/15/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR			TOSCANO, ALICIA		
ARLINGTON,	·	JOK .	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			1712		
			DATE MAILED: 09/15/2006	DATE MAILED: 09/15/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/510,337	KAWAGUCHI ET.AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Alicia M. Toscano	1712
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address -
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailir earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro	
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☑ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	awn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examina 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed as a composition and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct and the correct of the control of the correct of the control of the correct of the correct of the control of the correct of the correc	cepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureat * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicatority documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		·
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/05/04. S. Patent and Trademark Office	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal 6 6) Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 10/510,337

Art Unit: 1712

Priority

Page 2

Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of foreign priority under 35
 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) prior to declaration of an interference, a translation of the foreign application should be submitted under 37 CFR 1.55 in reply to this action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 2. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kern (US 4181685) in view of Okawa (WO 0142326, US 6365704 is used as an equivalent English translation) and Sextro (US 3872182).

Kern discloses a thermoplastic molding composition based on polyoxymethylenes. Said composition comprises 99.999 to 90 wt% linear polyoxymethylene and 0.001 to 10 wt% of a branched or crosslinked polyoxymethylene. (abstract) Example 1 discloses the linear polyoxymethylene to be the reaction product

Art Unit: 1712

of 98 wt% trioxane and 2 wt% ethylene oxide. These weight percentages meet the requirements of the wt% of (A), Claim 1. Kern does not disclose the melt index of said composition, however Sextro discloses the same composition (98 wt% trioxane and 2 wt% ethylene oxide) to have a melt index of 9 g/10 min (Table 1). Examiner thus finds the composition of Okawa to have a melt index of 9 g/10min, thus meeting all the limitations of component (A) of Claim 1.

Said linear polyoxymethylene is further blended with a branched polyoxymethylene. The branched or crosslinked polyoxymethylene is disclosed to be the reaction product of trioxane, a multifunctionally reactive compound and a monofunctionally reactive compound (Column 2 Lines 16-21). Example 1 further discloses the branched polyoxymethylene to be the product of 98 wt% trioxane, 1.8 wt% ethylene oxide, or monofunctional compound, and 0.2 wt% 1,4-butanediol-diglycidal ether, or multifunctional compound. The weight percentages of the components meet the requirements of the wt% set forth in Claim 1 for compound (B).

Kern only discloses the use of multifunctional groups with 2 glycidyl groups, and does not disclose the use of glycidyl ether compounds with 3 to 4 functional groups, as required in component (B) of Claim 1. Okawa discloses polyacetal copolymers. Said copolymers are the reaction product of (a) trioxane, (b) either (b-1) a compound having at least 3 glycidyl groups, such as trimethylolpropane triglycidyl either (Column 2 Line 60), or (b-2) a compound having at least 2 epoxy groups, such as 1,4-butanediol diglycidyl either (Column 3 Line 15) and (c) a cyclic ether (abstract). Both resins, with either 2 or 3+ glycidyl group components, are disclosed to improve the rigidity of the

Art Unit: 1712

resin while retaining properties such as appearance, slidability and thermal stability. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in Kern the use of a triglycidyl either, such as trimethylolpropane triglycidyl either, in the branched polyoxymethylene compound, as taught by Okawa, as these are taught to be functional equivalents in the art.

Page 4

The melt index of the branched polymer of Kern is disclosed to be from 0.5 to 20 g/10min (Column 6 Line 17). It is the Examiners position that the replacement of diglycidyl compound with a triglycidyl compound would not greatly effect the melt index. of the branched polymer, thus Kern and Okawa meet all the limitations of component (b) of Claim 1.

Further required is the melt index ratio. The melt index of the above composition is: 9 g/10min linear component (A) and 0.5 to 20 g/min branched component (B). The corresponding melt index ratio of B/A is 0.05 to 2.2 g/10min. Thus all the requirements of Claim 1 are met.

The melt index ratio discussed above meets the limitations of Claim 2. The use of trimethylol propane triglycidyl ether is discussed above and meets the limitations of Claim 3. The cyclic ether is disclosed to be ethylene oxide, as required by Claim 4.

Art Unit: 1712

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia M. Toscano whose telephone number is 571-272-2451. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 8:30 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Randy Gulakowski can be reached on 571-272-1302. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AMT

MARGARET G, MOORE

ARTUNIT 171